

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-23 and 26-28 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 11, 14, 22, 23 and 27 are amended, claim 28 is added and claims 24 and 25 are canceled. The independent claims are amended to even further distinguish over the applied references. In addition, independent claim 23 is amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claim 27 is amended to be consistent with amended claim 23. The features recited in new claim 28 are supported in the original specification at, for example, page 21, lines 9-24 and page 34, lines 16-21. No new matter is added by the above amendments.

Applicant thanks Examiner Aggarwal for the courtesies extended to Applicant's undersigned attorney during the August 18 telephone interview. The substance of the interview is detailed in the following additional remarks.

Claims 23-25 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 23 has been amended so that it is directed to a computer-readable recording medium that stores a computer-readable program having instructions. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 23 (and its dependent claim 27) comply with the current U.S. Patent and Trademark Office guidelines. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1, 4, 9, 11, 12 and 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,977,680 to Ichihara in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,618,553 to Shiohara. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that it would not have been obvious to modify the system of Ichihara, as proposed in the Office Action, to have an internal processing device that generates simplified image data as in Shiohara, because Ichihara specifically teaches against having such an internal processing device. See, for example, col. 2, lines 43-47 and col. 5, lines 41-42 of Ichihara. One goal of the Ichihara system is to avoid providing

"complicated processing apparatus in the digital camera." Thus, even if Shiohara produces thumbnail image data in its digital camera, it would have not been obvious to modify the Ichihara system to do so.

Furthermore, neither reference discloses transmitting "at least said basis image data to an external storage device after the processing device has generated the simplified image data" as recited in independent claims 1 and 14. Similarly, neither reference discloses transmitting "at least said basic image data to an external storage device after the simplified image data generation device has generated the simplified image data" as recited in independent claim 11, or "transmitting at least said basic image data to an external storage device after the simplified image data has been generated" as recited in independent claims 22 and 23. Simplified image data is not created in the Ichihara system until after the basic image data has been transmitted to the external device (which is where Ichihara creates the simplified image data), and Shiohara does not transmit basic image data to an external storage device.

Accordingly, Ichihara and Shiohara do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in the independent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Ichihara and Shiohara also do not disclose or suggest the features recited in new dependent claim 28, in which the control device controls the internal storage device to delete the basic image data from the internal storage device after a receipt completed signal has been received from the external storage device. The references do not mention receipt of any signal indicating that image data has been received by an external storage device.

Accordingly, claim 28 is patentable for this additional reason.

Claims 2, 5-8, 13-16, 18, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ichihara in view of Shiohara, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,784,925 to Tomat et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Tomat et al. does not overcome the deficiencies noted above with respect to Ichihara and Shiohara. Thus, these claims are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ichihara in view of Shiohara, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,532,039 to Anderson. In addition, claims 10, 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ichihara in view of Shiohara, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,400,392 to Yamaguchi et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed. These claims are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to their corresponding independent claims. Withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

MAC/ccs

Date: August 25, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

| |
|--|
| <p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p> |
|--|